SfA 42-18 (1-10)
SfA 64-10 (1-4+12)
App. F. IX-4

SfA 48-25 (5,6,7,8,9,12,13)
Previous References

SfA 59-19 (1,2,4,6+7)
SfA 111-30 (3-9)

Later References

SfA 305-04 (3, 4, 5)
— Dep. 212/35-
-4 4 18/36
SfA Secy No 11/37 Sd A17-37(5) Dep.

1933.
(SfA)

File No. 95/33
Serial Nos. 3, 4+5

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

S.P. 9-41 M31-2
S.P. 3-46-(1-2)

Serial Nos. 3

Part B for January '34

SUBJECT.

Continuance of the lapsed pension of Rs. 31-12-5 p.m. drawn by Ramamma Napathi of Chikkanna Pallegar family in the name of Ramappa Naik.

Sf(4) to Comptroller, SA 4420 d) 31.1.34

Sanctions are above.

5/2/34

Ranganna Nayakis Palegar pension

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 95-33 of 1933-34 | [App. F. III—2

Serial No. 3

From: Ramappa Naik. Petition dy 23.12.33.

Prays that his vacant pension enjoyed by the deceased Ranganna Nayaki of his Chitaldrug palegar family may be Continued in his name

1) The petitioner's Case has been discussed in the file SRA 111-30 (868 7+9) and decided against him. He now prays for the reconsideration of the Orders directing his lapse

2) A brief history of the Case is as follows.

The Chitaldrug Palegar Stipend of Rs 63-8-0 originally stood in the name of Srirangappa Naik as elder son of Chikka Madakari Naik. and Subsequently ordered to be divided equally between Srirangappa Naik and his nephew Ramappa Naik. (then a minor) son of Parasuramappa Naik, and registered separately in their names. As Ramappa Naik was then a minor, his mother Seethamma Nayaki was appointed as his guardian.

3) On the death of Srirangappa Naik his Share of the pension was ordered to be registered in the name of his widow Ranganna Nayaki in G.O. Ft 1868-9 / SRA 10-15-12 dy 25th Feb 16 for 31-12-5

4) Ranganna Nayaki having died in the petitioner is now claiming her pension

5) Their reference is invited to para 3 of the S. H. T. Officer's letter dy 23rd May 31 wherein it is stated that Ranganna Nayaki even while she was alive seems to have expressed her desire to transfer her share of the pension

W

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0434—GPB—15,000—12-10-33

SSA File No. 95 of 193 3

General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

Is Ramappa Naik, to pay back as 1923, which was not done for reasons stated in the S. H. T. Officer's letter

The petitioner bases his claim on the ground that in the Canara family under similar circumstances the vacant Stanam was at first given to the widow, and to the Separate nephews after the death of the widow (vide S & A 384-13 (Sls 1-2)

T

Their reference is invited to Mr B. Nagappa's Note dt 19.4.28, while disposing of the vacant Stanam of Hanumamma Nagathi and Chikka Sathyamma Nagathi of the Bhatkalam Pattegar family, he was inclined to view that as the Pattegar pensions were granted on political considerations they should not be regarded as hereditary devolving according to Hindu law.

U

S & A 40-25 (5, 6, 7, 8.

While on the passing of the pension of Chandamma of the Anegundi family, the Govt Advocate held the view that being a political pension, it is not in the strict sense of the term hereditable property. He was also of the opinion that it is open to Govt to withhold them after the death of the pensioner in whole or part, time or all times. But the Councillors were of the opinion that the pensions were regarded in the past as hereditary devolving according to Hindu law

(S & A 64-10.) Places below

Serial No.

Y.

a) This reference is also invited to Subordinate No 6 by late Rev J. Ananda Rao, dated 28th May 1911 in File No 64-10.

b) However the Vacant Stipend in question enjoyed by the late Chandamma of the Anegundi Polliegar family was distributed among the deserving claimants with the previous approval of His Highness the Maharaja after receiving the previous opinion expressed in the Case.

S+A 64-10-12 & 16.5.12. Flag X

~~Letter to above reference~~

c) The above Kind reference is invited to Khan Bahadur's Report dated 15th July 1901 on the petitions of Sreeramappa Naik and Seethamma Nagathi regarding the division of the stipend in question. From the letter it is seen that Srirangappa Naik had a brother Parasuramappa Naik who was divorced though living in a separate village was paying his monthly remittances for the maintenance of himself and his family. ~~The~~ division of ~~the stipend~~ the pension was however effected at the instigation of Seethamma mother of the petitioner Ramappa Naik (then a minor) (Vide X No 115-97-98/P.P.50 dated 11th June 1902) owing to family differences.

(X father of the petitioner Ramappa Naik)

P.

d) The whole question has been examined in detail in file 113-30 (709) and the pension ordered to lapse.

~~File~~ containing flags V & W.

e) Reference is invited to Mr B. Nagappa's opinion in S+A file 40-25 (2,5 ... 6,7) in which the policy and

Flag Z. dated 18.4.28

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 0434—GPB—15,000—12-10-33

Rangavanna Nagathi's Polliyar pension

SH File No. 95. 33 of 1933.

General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.

D... 15 JAN. 1934 No. 6534

law of devolution of Polliyar pensions has been discussed in detail.

NW 10/1/34

H Seey) 10/1/34.

I think there is considerable force in the petitioner's request which however was refused once in September 1931. (Flag V).

The applicant is himself a Polliyar pensioner drawing 31-12-5 being ½ of the pension which his paternal grandfather was enjoying. The other half was being enjoyed by his paternal uncle after his demise by the paternal aunt and is now reclaimed by the petitioner on the death of the aunt.

The petitioner is not a remote person outside the family or a member of the family - He is in direct male descent and in his own right is enjoying half of the pension - The case of the Tarikere family which he quotes is exactly similar and in that also the nephew who was getting ½ share was given the other half share which was enjoyed by his paternal uncle later by the uncle's widow after the death of the latter - No doubt - Govt have the right to lapse the pension but this does not seem to be a case in which male heirs are absent & lapsing should be waived. In these circumstances I think it would be fair to give it to him reconsidering the last order and as recommended by the Rajajinagar Babu sir originally in 1931.

Dewan.

14.1.34

15.1.34.

16-1-34

2065
95 Fl

Serial No.

17) Subs with a draft G.O. for approval
An endorsement to the petition is also put up
19/1/34 18) It is for orders whether the G.O. has to be given retrospective effect or the date
W 19/1 from which the pension should take effect is
S. for orders.

H Seey) 22/1/34.

19) What is the usual practice regarding A.?

No 28/1.

24/1/34.

20) Subs with reference to para 19 supra.

21) It has been the usual practice to sanction the Continuance of the vacant pensions with effect from the date of the death of the pensioners in clear cases of succession. Please see flags 'O', X, and T. and also L.

22) In this Case Rangamma Nagathi the pensioner died on 17th May 29. and the pension in question was ordered to take to work in the order of 9th Sept:
24/1 as the order is now reconsidered, it may be taken has to be construed as a case of renewal of lapsed pension & it seems therefore to be given effect to from 16.1.34, the date of Devan's order. There appear to be no precedents.

W 25/1

H Seey) 25/1/34.

23) Let it take Effect from the date of the present order 16.1.34

26/1/34

Issue.

25/1/34

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

S&A File No. 95 Secs' fl of 1933.

General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No.	
	G.O. No R 4420 dt 31.1.34
	To the Comptroller to Govt
4	Directs that the half Sharo of Rs 31-12-8 employed by the deceased Rangamma wife of the Lakshalonu Subedar family may be continued in the name of Ramappa Naik with effect from 16.1.34
5	End dt no R 4419. to Ramappa Naik Informs him of the above

W. 8/2

V. Rep

SHA-95-33-3.

FINANCIAL DEPARTMENT
DEC 1933
No.

Pet. No. 1181

2065

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE,

Bangalore, Dated, 23.12.1933

The accompanying petition addressed to the Dewan is forwarded, with compliments, to the ~~Chief~~ Secretary to Government, Financial Department.

By Order,

Private Secretary to the Dewan.

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN.
OF MYSORE.
Date of Receipt 23/12/33
Pres. Regr. No. 1181

To

Amin-ul-Mul,

Sir Mirza. M. Ismail.Kt, B.A., C.I.E., O.B.E.,

Dewan of Mysore,

B A N G A L O R E.

Sir,

I,the undersigned Ramappa Naik, Pallagar of Chittaldoorg residing in Tarekere, beg leave to bring the following few lines, to your kind and benevelent consideration, and needful orders.

2. I Submitted a claim petition for the vacant Pension of my Uncle late Sreerangappa Naik after the demise of my Aunt Rangamma Nagathi (Widow of Late Sreerangappa Naik) who died on the 17th May 1929. But the same was rejected Vide F. L. No.6984 dated 12-3-1932. Now I beg to submit that the petition might have been rejected as I did not put forward the full facts for the claim. I therefore crave permission, to put up the full facts for the claim through this petition, for reconsideration and needfull orders may kindly be passed thereon. For the guidance and consideration of my claim, I hereunder submit the Geneological Tree of my Family:-

Chikka Medekere Naik.
(Wife Suramma Nagathi)

Sreerangappa Naik (died) (no male issues) Pension 63-8-10. Wife Rangamma Nagathi. (died on 17-5-29)	Parasuramappa Naik (died 1898) Wife Seethamma Nagathi. Pension Rs. 31-12-5.(Guardian) Son Ramappa Naik. (Pensioner)

	1st Wife (died)		2nd Wife Kamamma Nagathi.
Sreerangappa Naik.	Nagarathnamma Nagathi.	Chikkamedekera Naik.	Parasuramappa Naik.

3. My Grand Father Chikkamedekere Naik died leaving two sons namely Late Sreerangappa Naik my Uncle and my Father Parasuramappa Naik. After the demise of my Grand Father My Uncle, who was head of the Family was drawing the whole stipend himself and paying his brother, after the death of my father Parasuramappa Naik in 1898, when I was a child of a year and half, myself and my Mother Seethamma Nagathi were under the Protection of my Uncle. In 1902, my Mother by the ill advice of some persons, put in a petition to the Government for the seperation of pension between myself and my Uncle, which was sanctioned by the Government in their order No. 11597-98/p.p.50 dated 11-1-1902. (Athenticated copy attached.) My Uncle Sreerangappa Naik died on(26th march 1916.) His portion of pension Rs. 31-12-5 was transfered to his wife Rangamma Nagathi my Aunt. In 17-5-1929 my Aunt died leaving no male issues to the vacant pension of my Uncle. I now claim for the vacant Pension of my Uncle Sreerangappa Naik which may kindly restored to me under the following grounds.

4. In the life time of my father my Uncle was drawing the full pension of Rs. 63-8-10 himself. And only after the death of my father and on the application of my Mother the above pension was divided between me and my Uncle. Even in the statement given by my Uncle Sreerangappa Naik to the treasury Officer, before the seperation of pension, he, my Uncle has emphitically stated that I am the only boy and Heir to both he and my father and my interest, may kindly be safe-guarded in case if I am not allowed to be under his guardianship. (Letter copy to the Treasury Officer attached) He also asked for the permission to adopt his brother-in-law's son, in case if I am not allowed to be with him. In this connection the Government in their Order No. mentioned above passed orders, only seperating the pension between me (under the guardianship of my Mother) and my Uncle, and differing with regard to the

question of adoption by my Uncle consedering me as heir to his stipend.

5. My elder father did not press further regarding the adoption again. In spite of separate pension given to my mother being my Guardian I continued to be with my Uncle now and then. (As my Mother and my Aunt Rangamma Nagathi wife of Sreerangappa Naik being Sisters, and Daughters of the same Father.) After the demise of my Uncle my Aunt brought and kept me with her giving her own Grand Daughter (daughter's daughter) in marriage to me in 1919, and I continued to be in their house. As shown in the Geneological Tree I had two sons and one Daughter by my first wife. After my first marriage, my mother,own sister of my Aunt hearing grudge again married me after a lapse of five years and in the life time of my first wife to my own Sister's daughter.(My mother's own grand daughter). I have a son by my second wife. Even after my second marriage, I was with my Aunt and every pension receipt was written by me and thumb impression of my Aunt was afixed and sent to Treasury to draw the pension of my Uncle as his Widow. By the misunderstandings of my mother with my Aunt, I was put into lot of inconceniances.

6. At the time of my Uncle's death as he had no male issues, and I being his younger brother's only son, performed the funeral rites according to the Hindu-Law, and as well the same rites to my Aunt Rangamma Nagathi when she died in 1929. According to Hindu-Law, I am the nearest reversioner of my Uncle being his nephew and am enjoying all his property after the demise of my uncle and his widowed wife Rangamma Nagathi. It is quite unjust on the part of the Government to lapse the pension of my Uncle on the ground that I am already geting a stipend of Rs.31-12-5. In this connection I beg to bring to your kind notice that the Government have granted the cacant half pention drawn by Surja Rangappa Naik to his elder

brother's son (nephew) late Surja Pattabhiramappa Naik, after the death of Honnamma Nagathi widow of Surja Rangappa Naik vide F.L.623-4 s&A 384-13-2 Dated 10-8-1914. (Order copy attached) In this connection I beg to add, that Surja Pattabhi Ramappa Naik grand father of Late Surja Pattabhiramappa Naik to whom the vacant half pension was granted was the son of Surja Hanumappa Naik who was the son of Surja Pattabhiramappa Naik's first wife, and Surja Rangappa Naik being the son of Second wife of Surja Pattabhiramappa Naik. After the death of Surja Rangappa Naik his prtion of pension was given to his wife Honnamma Nagathi. After her death Surja Pattabhiramappa Naik nephew of serja Rangappa Nik who was getting a pension of Rs 126-9-0 claimed for the vacant pension of his Uncle. The Government was pleased to order thereon, directing the vacant stipend of Rs.126-9-0 may also be disbursed, with effect from the death of his Aunt to Surja Pattabhiramappa Naik who was been enjoying the other half of the pention in his own right.

7. When the Government have passed such an order, I do not know why unfortunately, I was not treated in the same manner as my brother Pallegar was treated? I am only getting a small stipend of Rs.31-12-5 and having two sons and a daughter by my first wife and a son by my second wife. It will be a great help to my family and to my children for their education. I beg of you therefore to Consider my right to the vacant pension of my Uncle Sreerangappa Naik as I have a right for the same as his nephew. Further my Aunt also made an application during her life time for the transfer of my Uncle's pension drawn by her to me. After the demise of my Aunt, the then Treasury Officer, after considering my claims to the vacant pension passed orders, permitting me to draw my Uncle's pension vide indorsement No.1012 dated 11-9-29. (Original copy attached.) But I could not do so as an order has to be passed by the Government to that effect.

8. It will not be out of place to make mention and to draw your esteemed attention to the openion of Late Dewan Rangacharlu with regard to the Pallegar stipendaries in residency No.117 dated 12th August 1888 which states that "the pension given to the pallegara of the Mysore State is not allowed to lapse but continue to the same family to the last male holder". Proceedings are abundent wherein the Government have regulated the succession of the family pension to general principals of Hindu-law vide proceedings camp No. 1678 dated 29-10-1897. And also explained that "the pension given to these pallegars in Mysore State is peculiar in itself than those granted in the Madras presidency. The Pension given to these pallegars are in lieu of palepat lands they were enjoying and which were taken up by the government. Therefore the pensions given to these pallegars should not be lapsed to the Government under any circumstances except when there are no claiments." I am also submitting a few of the Government orders -I have come across, within they have directed the vacant pensions to be distributed to the other pensioners of the same family, for perusal.

9. In conclution I beg to state that my claim to the vacant pension of my Uncle Late Sreerangappa Naik as his nephew may kindly be reconsidered and also beg, that I may not be deprived of my rights to the vacant pension on frevilous grounds, when I have a right to enjoy the same as my other Co-Pallegar, stipendaries. Lapse of time does not bar the petitioner who seeks redress at the hands of the benign Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore. I further beg that the original copies attached herein may kindly be returned to me after perusal. I beg to appeal to your honour to reconsider my claim to the vacant pension of my Uncle and sanction it, thus helping this poor petitioner.

For this act of benevelance I shall ever pray for your honours long life and properity.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obediant Servant,

Pallegar of Chitladurg.
c/o S. Narasoji Rao
Pallegar Agent
Basavanagudi.

Bangalore,
23-12-33.

Copies attached:-

1. G.O. F.L. No.1714 S & A 111-30-9-D/ 9-9-31.
2. G.O. 6984 Dated 12-3-32.
3. My Uncle's Statememnt to the Treasury Offeser on 19-4-1901.
4. G.O. 11597-8/pp 50 Dated 11-1-1902.
5. G. O. 1868-9 S & A 10-15-11 Dated 25-9-1916.
6. Application of my Aunt to the Treasury Offeser dated 10-4-1923.
7. G. o. F.L. No. 623-4 S & A 384-13-2 of 10-8-191
8. Indorsemtn of the Treasury officer 1012 S.H. T. dated 11-9-1929.
9. G. O. No. 4937-8 S & A 64-10-4 Dated 16-5-1912.
10. G. O. 7847 S & A. 59-19-6 dated 26-4-1920.
11. G. O. No. 8466-67 P.P. 32 Dated 4-12-1901.

-:oooOooo:-

G. R. S. App. F VI—G 2]

2 Grants

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

3 copies

Section SMA.

File No. 95-33.

Serial No. 4

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Date of issue..... 31/1/1934

Signed by.....

Read— G.O. No 71 1868-9 / SMA 10-15-12 Dy 25th Sept 1916 sanctioning the Pallegar transfer of the pension of Rs 3-12-5 in the name of Srirangappa Naik of the Chitaloog Pallegar family to the widow Rangamma Nagathi after the death of her husband Srirangappa Naik.

Order thereon.— No 2. G.O. No 71 1914 / SMA 111-3 Dy 9th Sept 31 rejecting the claim of Ramappa Naik, nephew of Srirangappa Naik to the pension enjoyed by the deceased Rangamma Nagathi and directing that it do lapse to Govt.

May this be—

(i) printed ?

(ii) treated as a standing order ?

(iii) published in the Gazette, English part ?

(iv) translated ?

(v) placed at the disposal of the press ?

(vi) published in the Gazette, kannada part ? V

WW 3/31/34

3. Pet dy 20-12-33 from Ramappa Naick of Chitaloog Pallegar family praying, for reasons explained, for a re-Confirmation of G.O. dy 4th Sept 31 And requesting that the Vacant Stipend Rs 31-12-5 be Continued in his name.

Cross Ref :- G.

The Chitaloog Pallegar Stipend of Rs 53-8-10 Originally Noted in the name of Srirangappa Naik, the petitioners paternal uncle & Afterwards in the name of Ramaswamappa Naik & petitioner's father for the benefit of the Entire family.

Brother of Srirangappa Naik, the shares in question was ordered to be divided equally between Srirangappa Naik - and his brother Ramappa Naik, — the petitioner — and registered separately in their names. On the death of Srirangappa Naik without male issue, his share of the pension viz Rs 31-12-5 was transferred to his widow Rangamma Nagathi.

List of Enclosure

Copied by

Examined by

2. Rangamma Nagathi having

G. R. S. App. F. G. 3.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

died issueless / on 17th May 29 / his pension of Rs 31-12-5 was ordered to lapse to Govt

3 Ramappa Naik ~~son of Srirangappa Naik's brother & husband of deceased Ranganna Nagathi~~ the present applicant is himself a pallegar pensioner drawing Rs 31-12-5 per mensem being half of the pension which his paternal grand father Parasurampappa Naik was enjoying the other half being enjoyed by his paternal uncle Srirangappa Naik and after his demise by his paternal aunt Ranganna Nagathi* ~~is the nephew of~~

4. Having regard to the fact that Ramappa Naik is not a remote member of the family and that he is in direct male descent and in his own right enjoying half of the pension viz Rs 31-12-5 of the family

WD 0255—GPB—10,000—23-8-32

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

Read:-

Government order No.Fl.1868-9/ S & A.10-15-12 dated 25th September 1916 sanctioning the transfer of the Pallegar pension of Rs.31-12-5 in the name of Srirangappa Naik of the Chitaldrug Pallegar family to the widow Rangamma Nagathi after the death of her husband Srirangappa Naik.

2. Government order No.Fl.1714/ S & A.111-30-9 dated 9th September 1931 directing that the pension enjoyed by the deceased ~~Rangamma~~ Rangamma Nagathi -should lapse to Government.

3. Petition dated 23rd December 1933 from Rangappa Naik of the Chitaldrug Pallegar family praying, for reasons explained, for a reconsideration of Government order dated 9th September 1931 and requesting that the vacant stipend of Rs.31-12-5 be continued in his name.

Order No. ಸ್ಟ4420 ಸ್ಟಸಾ 95-33-4

Dated, Bangalore, the 31st January 1934.

The Chitaldrug Pallegar stipend of Rs.63-8-10 originally stood -in the name of Srirangappa Naik, the petitioner's paternal uncle for the benefit of the entire family. After the death of Parasuramappa Naik, brother of Srirangappa Naik and petitioner's father the stipend in question was ordered to be divided equally between Srirangappa Naik and his nephew Ramappa Naik, the petitioner and registered separately in their names. On the death of Srirangappa Naik without male issues his share of ~~Srirangappa~~ the pension viz., Rs.31-12-5 was transferred to his widow Rangamma Nagathi.

2. Rangamma Nagathi having died issueless on 17th May 1929 her pension of Rs.31-12-5 was ordered to lapse to Government.

3. Ramappa Naik , the present applicant is himself a pallegar pensioner drawing Rs.31-12-5 now, being half of the pension which his paternal grand father Parasuramappa Naik was enjoying the other half being - enjoyed by his paternal uncle Srirangappa Naik and after his demise by

by the paternal aunt Rangamma Nagathi.

4. Having regard to the fact that Ramappa Naik is not a remote member of the family and that he is of direct male descendant and in his own right enjoying half of the pension viz., Rs.31-12-5 of the family, Government are pleased to reconsider the case and direct that the vacant half stipend of Rs.31-12-5 per mensem be registered and continued in the name of Ramappa Naik with effect from 16th January 1934.

M. Shamanna

for Financial Secretary to Govt.

To

The Comptroller to Government.

mk.3

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue..... 31/1/34

Signed by.....

List of enclosures.....

Copied by..... 31/1

Examined by.....

Section S. & A.

File No. 95-33

Serial No. 5

No. 2E 4919 Emg

To Mr. Ramappa Naik

c/o ~~Pattegar of Chitaldrug in Jamil~~ S. Narasoji Rao, Pallegar Agent Basavanapura

In reply to his petition dt 23-12-33 in his name praying for the continuance of the Pallegar pension of Rs 31-12-5 per annum enjoyed by Rangamma Nagathi, the ~~petitioner~~ petitioner Ramappa ~~Naik~~ is informed that Govt have been ~~pleased to issue~~ passed orders in G.O.No. . . . Sanctioning the continuance of the pension ~~of~~ to him. ~~in favour of him.~~ with effect from 16th Jan 34.

The enclosures received with his petition are returned herewith.

By Order
31/1/34.
for Financial Secy

WD 0253—GPB—15,000—26-8-32